

REMARKS

The Office Examined claims 1-36, and claims 1, 3-6, 10, 12-15 and 20-36 are rejected and claims 2, 7-9, 11 and 16-19 are objected to as dependent upon a rejected base claim. With this response claims 1, 2, 8, 10-11, 14, 17-18, 20-21, 25-26, 30-31 and 35 are amended, and claims 7 and 16 are cancelled. All amendments are fully supported by the specification as originally filed. Claims 1, 25, 30 and 35 are amended to incorporate the limitations recited in now cancelled claim 7. Claim 10 is amended to incorporate the limitations recited in now cancelled claim 16.

Claim Objections

In section 1, on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-9 and 35-36 are objected to due to informalities. Claim 1-9 are amended accordingly to change “said communication packets” to “said communication content packets.” Furthermore, claim 35 is amended to recite “the intercepted communication,” which refers to the “intercepted communication” recited previously in the claim.

Allowable Subject Matter

In section 7, on page 10 of the Office Action, claims 2, 7-9, 11 and 16-19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but are indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, claim 1 is amended to include the limitations of objected claim 7, and as such, applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 as amended is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, alone or in combination. Furthermore, claim 10 is amended to include the limitations recited in objected to claim 16, and as such, applicant respectfully submits that claim 10 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, alone or in combination. Independent claims 20, 25, 30 and 35 are also amended to include limitations recited in objected to claim 7. Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that claims 20, 25, 30 and 35 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, alone or in combination.

Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the amendments to the independent claims, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) on pages 2 and 9 of the Office


Action respectively are moot. Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that the claims as amended are in condition for allowance

Conclusion

The objects and rejections of the Office Action having been obviated by amendment or shown to be inapplicable, withdrawal thereof is requested, and passage to issue of the present application is earnestly solicited. The undersigned hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge deposit account 23-0442 for any fee deficiency required to submit this response.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 22 May 2007



Keith R. Obert
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 58,051

KRO/kas
Ware, Fressola, Van Der Sluys
& Adolphson LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephon: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
Customer No. 004955